REMARKS

Claim Rejections

Claims 1-3 and 6-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leonaggeo et al. (5,646,605) in view of Acimovic et al. (5,517,185). Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leonaggeo et al. in view of Acimovic et al. and further in view of Jean-Claude et al. (6,078,653). Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Acimovic et al. in view of Jean-Claude et al.

Drawings

It is noted that the Examiner has accepted the drawings as originally filed with this application.

Claim Amendments

By this Amendment, Applicant has canceled claims 2, 3, and 5, and amended claims 1 and 4 of this application. It is believed that the amended claims specifically set forth each element of Applicant's invention in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112, and define subject matter that is patentably distinguishable over the cited prior art, taken individually or in combination.

Applicant believes that amended independent Claim 1 and the original independent claim 6 both are patentably distinguishable over the cited references for the reasons detailed below.

(1) Claim 1 was amended to incorporate the limitations of canceled Claims 2 and 3 to clearly recite that a resident uses a cellular phone to dial said entrance intercom system for unlocking said gate.

The specification of the present invention, page 8, paragraphs [0020] and [0021], clearly describes that even when residents forget to carry ID cards or remote controllers, cellular phones are usable to dial the entrance intercom system (10) and open the gate (11), because the CPU (20) will send a driving signal to open the gate (11) after ascertaining the incoming phone number identical to one stored in the database (18).

On page 2 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner stated that Leonaggeo et al. (col. 4 lines 49-63; col. 7 lines 32-45) discloses a similar design to the present invention. However, the Applicant believes that there are significant differences between the present invention and Leonaggeo et al.

First, referring to FIG 1 and column 4, lines 49-63, and column 7, lines 32-45, Leonaggeo et al. teaches that by applying the system (100) users can lock or unlock the remote lock device (105) or portable receiving device (106) by optionally dialing up the system controller at the telephone (101), the desktop input unit (113) (such as a desktop page entry terminal), or the telephone/desktop input unit combination input terminal (115), and the input terminal (111).

It is noted that one point of distinction is that the present invention provides users a convenience to use their cellular phone as a key to pass the identity recognition and to open the gate when they forget to take their ID cards or remote control. Namely, in the present invention, users can dial the portable/mobile phones to unlock the gate which is immovable. However, in Leonaggeo et al., the apparatus only allows users to manually enter the call address and the lock/unlock instructions that are immobile, such as by a wired telephone (101), an input terminal (111), a desktop input unit (113) or the input unit combination (115) illustrated in FIG 1. Apparently, it is impossible for users to carry those cumbersome apparatuses on their person to substitute as the key to open the gate. Particularly Leonaggeo et al. only teaches the use of an immobile apparatus, which are wired, to lock/unlock the portable receiving device (106) and remote lock device (105).

(2) Examiner also cited column 6, lines 39-60 of Leonaggeo et al. to reject Claim 6 of the present invention, which states:

> The security utility 501 includes at least one lock condition and one unlock condition, changes of which are generated by the security utility and communicated from the security utility 501 to the command generator 502. For example, the lock and unlock conditions can be associated in the security utility 501 with a privacy condition of a display screen of the input terminal (commonly referred to as a screen saving state), or to an access condition of a disk memory of the input terminal 111, as provided in the Safety Suite software. The change of the

> security mode of the input terminal 111 to an unlock state is preferably associated with a change of access condition in the security utility 501 requiring a password entry (which is a user input 507). The change of the security mode of the input terminal 111 to a lock state is preferably associated with any one of three changes of condition in the security utility 501: a menu selection (which is a user input 507), a duration without keyboard activity (which is a response to an event 505) and the occurrence of a predetermined time of day (which is a response to an event 505). Alternatively, other inputs can be used to initiate a change of condition in the security utility 501.

Basically, this paragraph talks about the manner of switching between the lock condition and the unlock condition in the security utility (501). However, it did not describe the method of managing data of an entrance intercom system as recited in Claim 6 of the present invention, nor does it describe the steps of making records when said entrance intercom system is applied to dial, to answer a phone call, or locking/unlocking the gate; dialing a system service provider at a predetermined time to contact with a computer of the system service provider; uploading the records to said computer of the system service provider; and downloading data from said computer of the system service provider to upgrade said database.

(3) Regarding to Claim 7 of the present invention, the Examiner stated that Leonaggeo et al., column 6, lines 39-67, and column 12, lines 42-49, of discloses the present invention.

However, the serial communications card that Leonaggeo et al. suggested is namely the system controller (1710), which includes the complicated devices such as the lock code data base (1820), the message handler (1815) and the wireline interface (1810) as shown in FIG 18. No matter the framework or application of the serial communications card both are not identical or equivalent to that of the ID cards of the present invention.

(4) Examiner cited the paragraph of col. 6 line 39 to col. 7 line 31 to reject Claim 10 of the present invention.

Applicant respectfully submits that, in the present invention because the cellular phone number is applied to a server as the identity recognition means, the information of residents moving in or out of the community must be timely updated in the entrance intercom system. However, Leonaggeo et al. does not disclose using the cellular phone number to serve as the spare key for opening the gate, it is not needed to update the information of moving out/in of the residents timely as recited in the present invention.

Applicant submits that even if the teachings of Leonaggeo et al., Acimovic et al., and Jean-Claude et al. were combined, as suggested by the Examiner, the resultant combination does not suggest a modification of their specifically disclosed structures that would lead one having ordinary skill in the art to arrive at Applicant's claimed structure. Applicant hereby respectfully submits that no combination of the cited prior art renders obvious Applicant's amended claims.

Summary

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that this application is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. Should any points remain in issue, which the Examiner feels could best be resolved by either a personal or a telephone interview, it is urged that Applicant's local attorney be contacted at the exchange listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 22, 2005 By: _____

Bruce H. Troxell
Reg. No. 26,592

TROXELL LAW OFFICE PLLC
5205 Leesburg Pike, Suite 1404
Falls Church, Virginia 22041
Telephone: 703 575-2711
Telefax: 703 575-2707